



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,243	12/06/2001	Scott C. Sanner	7784-000356	5792

27572 7590 09/08/2003

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010243

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6-18-03

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

## Application Papers

☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 6-18-03 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

New drawings sheets have been received. Applicant is asked <sup>if</sup> these are intended as formal. Spec. Page 10, line 8, "50" not seen in figs.

Spec. For fig. 3, power box mounted "under seat should be added if that is true.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 1, 9, 10, 15, attachment to existing structure and claim 2 "same specification" feature must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Use of existing attachment means is basic to the inventive concept but is not shown in a clear manner. For claim 2, prior art cover is shown in fig. 2. The fig. 4 covers appear to be of "different dimensions" rather than of the same dimensions as the fig 2 cover. For claim 2, in this regard, would seem to require a cover like that of fig 2 in size but with "additional connectors" mounted thereon. Is such cover part of intended invention? If so it should be more clearly discussed in the spec. For existing attachment feature, see sketches of plates with holes 60 for screws shown for both old and new covers. This feature could be added to figs. with added discussion in spec. and with indication that such faceplate holes for screws are standard in the art. Other structures could be used to show this aspect <sup>if</sup> more appropriate.

Art Unit: 2839

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Thompson, Luu and Pritchard.

Prior art discloses an aircraft seat mounted power port cover. The cover is only for a single outlet port 26. Thompson, Luu and Pritchard discloses cover plates with multiple diverse ports used in place of pre-existing cover plates and attached by same fasteners in both cases. It would have been obvious, in view of these patents to remove an existing cover and to replace it with a larger cover having added connectors in view of Thompson, figs. 1, 4 and Luu, fig. 1, 4, 5 or to use a same size cover, as in Pritchard, but having different type connectors, these changes would enable individuals to use new types of electrical equipment. For claims 1, 9, 15, just what weight change is referred to is unclear and such aspect cannot be relied upon to overcome the rejection. In addition, it would be obvious to minimize cover weight if that be a problem. Also, obvious to include openings as in Thompson at 16, 18 to enable use of original power outlet while adding new connectors. For claim 2, obvious to form new cover of substantially same size or prior one as seems to be true for Luu added covers. Claims 4-7, 11-14, 18, 19, 20 to specific connector types and cover weights define matters of obvious design that do not appear to be at issue.

In addition, for claims, 1-14, 19, 20 once a cover, like that of Thompson, fig. 4 or Luu fig. 4 is in place and certified, it becomes the existing cover mounted to an existing power port. Obvious to use such a cover as original equipment on an aircraft for the added capabilities it supplies. Such cover would be adequate for claims 1-14, 19, 20 since only an article is being

Art Unit: 2839

claimed. Manner of assembly cannot be relied upon. For claims 15-18, new cover (Thompson type) is read as having opening for power port and additional connectors and as being certified. Obvious to replace such cover with like cover if it becomes damaged the new cover having same additional connectors. These steps would meet claim 15.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As to drawings, numeral 53 does not denote attachment features in a clear manner. The weight increase arguments are not effective. Just what weight change would require recertification is unclear and might vary with time or aircraft type. For claim 2, no specific arguments are presented and rejection is maintained. Basically claims 1, 9, 15 do not define unobviously over use of faceplate with "extended portion", like 14 of Thompson, in place of existing aircraft faceplate, with same fastener used in both cases (54 of Thompson). The teachings of wall faceplate replacement as in Thompson, col 2, lines 30-53 are seen to be applicable to aircraft power outlet boxes. Pritchard and Luu also teaches such replacement aspect.

Also for the article claims only cover with connectors and opening and mounted to certified structure are positively set forth. Manner of assembly not of patentable weight. For claim 16, "upgrade" aspect not clearly required. Claim 15 does not clearly require new cover to have additional connectors over those on the replaced cover.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2839

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

N ABRAMS/pj

09/04/03

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322




FIG. 1  
PRIOR ART




FIG. 2  
PRIOR ART




FIG. 3  
PRIOR ART




FIG. 4